

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This Examination Statement is submitted by Reside Developments. Reside has been promoting “Land at Willowbrook Farm, Hambrook (‘the Site’) since 2021, also referred to HELLA site HSB0001a. The site partially falls within the proposed Nutbourne to Hambrook corridor.
- 1.2 The site has been subject to a planning application (21/01910/OUT) for 63 dwellings which received officers’ recommendation for approval (with no objection from the Council’s ecologist or Natural England) the recommendation was overturned by members at committee and is currently at appeal.
- 1.3 Reside’s Representations to Chichester District Council (CDC) Regulation 19 Local Plan consultation were submitted by Tetra Tech and were given the following references 4780 Duty to Co-Operate, 4783 Policy S1 Spatial Development Strategy, 4786 Policy NE3 Landscape Gaps between settlements, 4789 Policy NE4 Strategic Wildlife Corridors, 6161 Policy H3 Non-Strategic Parish Housing Requirements 2021 – 2039.

2. Response to Inspectors Initial Matters, Issues and Questions on Matter 5 Other Policies

- 2.1 Reside’s representations to the Regulation 19 consultation related only to Policies NE3 Landscape Gaps between settlements and NE4 Strategic Wildlife Corridors, therefore only the questions related to those policies are covered in this statement.

Policy NE3 Landscape Gaps between settlements

Q.115 Policy NE3 seeks to protect gaps between settlements. Landscape gaps are not identified through this Plan, and instead are intended to be identified in a Site Allocations DPD or Neighbourhood Plans. Is Policy NE3 consistent with national policy, justified, clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals, and would it be effective?

- 2.2 Reside believe as per their Regulation 19 representations that this policy is too ambiguous, detail that could be provided now is not and has been pushed down the line. The policy does not provide certainty for a decision maker and is open to inconsistent decision making until such gaps are identified through the Site Allocations DPD or through Neighbourhood Plans.

Q.116 Are the suggested MMs necessary for soundness?

- 2.3 As per our representations, further guidance or caveats to the future gaps would provide greater certainty and/or gaps to be identified now.

Policy NE4 Strategic Wildlife Corridors

Q.117 Is the extent of protection proposed to be afforded to Strategic Wildlife Corridors consistent with national policy as set out in the NPPF?

- 2.4 No comment.

Q.118 Is the proposed sequential test consistent with national policy and is it justified?

- 2.5 As set out in our representations, there is no need for a sequential test if there is no harm, and therefore it is not considered this is justified. It is noted that the Council proposed to remove this criterion through modifications, which Reside welcome.

Q.119 What is meant by 'in close proximity' and in this regard would the Policy be effective?

- 2.6 'In close proximity' can be seen as ambiguous and does not give any certainty on whether this policy will be required to be met. Criteria could be set for this, i.e. immediately adjacent or within a certain distance etc.

Q.120 Are the boundaries of the proposed Strategic Wildlife Corridors justified?

- 2.7 Reside welcome the Council's conclusion on the Nutbourne to Hambrook corridor boundary within the Strategic Wildlife Corridor Background Paper (June 2024) at paragraph 4.23, and therefore have no further comments on the boundaries of the corridors.

Q.121 Are the suggested MMs necessary for soundness?

- 2.8 Reside welcome the Council's suggested modifications on Policy NE4 Strategic Wildlife Corridors, it allows for development to come forward that could be beneficial to the Strategic Wildlife Corridors.

3. Summary

- 3.1 Given the Council's suggested modifications to Policy NE4 Strategic Wildlife Corridors, Reside's objections to the policy will be resolved if the Inspector accepts these modifications. Therefore, if it would be beneficial to the Inspector we are content to not to attend the hearings.